UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,912	06/13/2005	Tatsuya Ohashi	050381	9528
	7590 03/24/200 TOS & HANSON, LL	EXAMINER		
1420 K Street, N.W.			GRUN, JAMES LESLIE	
Suite 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1641	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Comments	10/538,912	OHASHI, TATSUYA					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	JAMES L. GRUN	1641					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 Fe	bruary 2009.						
/ <u> </u>	action is non-final.						
	/ 						
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
<u> </u>							
4) Claim(s) <u>1,7 and 9</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
'							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
	6) Claim(s) <u>1,7 and 9</u> is/are rejected.						
	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	·.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 1 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)							
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:							

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03 February 2009 has been entered. Claims 2-6, 8, and 10-16 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 7, and 9 remain in the case.

Applicant's amendments limiting the claims, the statement of Katsuhiro Katayama, and the copies of the receipt forms sent by the International Depositary Authority showing that viable cell lines were deposited under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, filed 03 February 2009 are sufficient to place the deposits of the hybridomas designated as Trk49 (FERM BP-8249) and Trk62 (FERM BP-7890) in compliance with the Deposit rules and have obviated the prior rejections under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 7, and 9 are vague in the absence of recitation of deposit accession numbers to clearly identify the antibody/hybridoma because, absent the recitation of deposit accession

numbers, it is not clear what structure and properties are encompassed by the antibodies named as "Trk49" and "Trk62."

In claim 7, it is not clear which of the carriers in claim 1 is being limited. The examiner would suggest in claim 1, --wherein the first antibody and the second antibody are both adsorbed on a first carrier, or wherein the first antibody is adsorbed on a first carrier and the second antibody is adsorbed on a second carrier dispersed in solution or is dissolved in a solution--, and in claim 7, --wherein the first carrier--.

Applicant's arguments filed 05 February 2009 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Notwithstanding applicant's assertions to the contrary, applicant's amendments have not obviated rejections under this statute for the reasons set forth above.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Page 4

Art Unit: 1641

Claim 9 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10-13 of U.S. Patent No. 7,074,903. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of both the patent and the instant application encompass kits comprising solid phase-immobilized Trk62 (FERM BP-7890) and a second antibody, generically in the patent and specifically in the instant application. However, the Trk49 (FERM BP-8249) antibody is fully disclosed in the patent as useable with the Trk69 antibody in sandwich assays, and there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application, which matured into a patent. Further, particulate labels are notoriously old and well known in the art as is their use in sandwich immunoassays and it would have been obvious to have labeled the second antibody of the kit in the patent with such a label for detection.

Applicant's arguments filed 05 February 2009 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Application/Control Number: 10/538,912

Art Unit: 1641

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James L. Grun, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0821. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Shibuya, SPE, can be contacted at (571) 272-0806.

The phone number for official facsimile transmitted communications to TC 1600, Group 1640, is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application, or requests to supply missing elements from Office communications, should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/J. L. G./ James L. Grun, Ph.D. Examiner, Art Unit 1641 March 24, 2009

/Ann Y. Lam/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1641 March 20, 2009